

REMARKS

Applicant is filing this Response in reply to the outstanding Final Official Action of October 18, 2007, and the Applicant believes the Response to be fully responsive to the Final Official Action for at least the reasons set forth below in greater detail.

In the Final Official Action, claims 1-7 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Chee (previously cited) in view of (previously cited).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection and traverses with at least the following reasons.

In responding to our previous arguments, the Examiner acknowledges that Chen does not teach two modes; however, the Examiner asserts that since Chee teaches two modes, it is not relevant that Chen does not.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner; the fact that Chen fails to teach two modes is relevant.

Applicant submits that the combined teaches fails to teach each and every feature of the claimed invention. Notably, claim 1 recites, wherein in said power saving mode, voltages corresponding to most significant bit signals of said image display data are applied as display data signals to said data electrodes. Accordingly, the fact that Chen does not teach two modes is highly relevant and (I) directly contradicts a motivation to combine and (II) must be examined to determine Chen's scope. Chen teaches a low power data driver. However, the data driver would exhibit low power in any mode of operation including a normal operating mode.

Chen only teaches one mode, which can be considered a “normal driving mode”. In Chen, the normal driving mode is a low power mode. Therefore, applicant submits that there is no suggestion to only use the MSB of the display data when in a power saving mode and not in a normal driving mode.

Moreover, Chen does not teach that using the MSB saves power. Chen teaches that the reduced power is achieved using a **stepwisely charging**. The reference does not suggest that using the MSB reduces power (instead of all bits). The abstract states that a power-saving data driver for stepwisely applying alternative driving voltages is disclosed. A given pixel is stepwisely driven from a driving voltage of the last pixel to a driving voltage of the given pixel as a target voltage. Chen describes in several places that the **power dissipation of the data line driver can be largely reduced by means of the stepwise charge**. Chen states “in order to reduce the power dissipation, the method of stepwise charge and discharge is applied in the present invention.” *See* Col. 3, lines 54-57. Further, Chen describes the relation between the number of steps and the power dissipation. *See* Col. 3, lines 58-66.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited references; the references fail to teach, suggest or render obvious, each and every limitation of the claim.

Applicant further submits that claims 2-7 and 42 are patentable over the cited references based at least upon the above-identified analysis.

Applicant submits that claim 2 is separately patentable over the cited combination for at least the following additional reasons.

Claim 2 recites, *inter alia*, **essential information display mode**, wherein a **predetermined uniform voltage level**, which corresponds to a predetermined **color** and which

is **independent** from said image display data, **is uniformly applied to all data electrodes on other regions than at least a designated region for displaying the essential information** (Emphasis Added).

In the final Official Action, the Examiner refers to four different display modes. However, in each of the four different display modes, all images are treated the same. The Examiner asserts that Chee, at Col. 5, lines 37-65, teaches this feature. Nowhere in the identified section is there a teaching of the claimed essential information display mode.

Chen teaches that power could be saved by completely shutting the display off, having the pixel clock slowed, displaying the images at a dimmed level or a reduced gray scale. None of the described power saving modes teaches displaying essential information.

The Examiner also cited Col.7 lines 9-44. Similarly, the identified section fails to support the Examiner's position.

In other words, none of the power saving modes, in Chee, includes an essential information display mode or region for displaying essential information. Chee teaches **one display region whereas in the claimed invention there can be more than one display region.**

Accordingly, claim 2 is separately patentable over the cited references.

Applicant further submits that claims 3 and 4 are separately patentable over the cited references. The Examiner asserts that the limitations are broadly interpreted to mean on and off states of the display. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the interpretation. Normally black and normally white displays are terms well known in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art would not interpret these terms to be "Off" and "On".

Accordingly, claims 3 and 4 are separately patentable over the cited combination.

Applicant also submits that claim 5 is separately patentable over the cited references based at least upon the same reasoning as claim 2. The references, whether taken alone or in any combination thereof, fail to teach, suggest or render obvious, the limitation of “ a uniform scanning signal is simultaneously applied to all scanning electrodes on other regions than said at least designated region for displaying the essential information,” as recited in claim 5.

Accordingly, claim 5 is separately patentable over the cited combination.

Applicant also submits that claim 6 is separately patentable over the cited combination. Claim 6 recites, *inter alia*, wherein at least a partial color display region in said color display is displayed in said power saving mode. Chee discloses a reduced gray scale mode, not a partial color display mode. Chee teaches a full color mode and a reduced gray scale mode. A partial color display mode is not equivalent to a reduced gray scale mode. Applicant notes that the Final Official Action did not address Applicant’s arguments with respect to claim 6.

Accordingly, claim 6 is separately patentable over the cited combination.

Claims 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Chee, in view of Chen, and in further view of Kim.

Applicant disagrees with the rejection of claims 39 and 40 based at least upon the above identified analysis and in view of their dependency, whether directly or indirectly, from claim 1.

Based upon the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-7, 39, 40 and 42 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In conclusion, the Applicant believes that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance and henceforth respectfully solicits the Examiner to allow the application. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite the allowance of this application, the

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call the undersigned, Applicant's attorney, at the following telephone number: (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Seth Weinfeld", written over the printed name.

Seth Weinfeld

Registration No: 50,929

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
516-742-4343

SW:reg